

R E M A R K S

Claims 1 and 8 currently remain in the application. Claims 2 -7 and 9 have been canceled. Claims 1 and 8 are herein amended.

Claims 1 and 8 were rejected firstly under 35 U.S.C. 112 in Paragraph 2 of the Official Letter. In response, applicant amends claims 1 and 8 according to the Examiner's suggestion for which applicants are grateful to and thank the Examiner.

Claims 1 and 8 were rejected secondly under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Murata in Paragraph 3 of the Official Letter. Although applicant agrees that a patent language by principle deserves a broad interpretation, the Examiner must admit that the breadth of interpretation is not allowed to be unlimited. Thus, the issue to be determined here is whether or not it is reasonable to conclude that Murata, when the language "conventional release papers" was used, intended to include therein the kind of sheet of polyethylene terephthalate with center line average roughness on the order of $0.1\mu\text{m}$ when peeled off from a base sheet, or possibly the kind of tapes described in USP 5,032,432 (or "Sakumoto") newly cited by the Examiner. Applicant believes, for the reasons stated below, that Murata did not.

Sakumoto relates to an adhesive tape for die bonding (very first sentence in its Abstract), having uniquely its own requirements such as preventing voids from being generated between the adhesive layer and the die pad and for which the adhesive surface of the tape must be in a mirror-surface condition with Ra in the range of $0.5\text{-}2.3\mu\text{m}$. By contrast, Murata relates to heat-peelable adhesive sheets for temporarily attaching a semiconductor wafer during its dicing process. This means that Murata's sheets do not require a surface with such a high level of flatness. In other words, Murata and Sakumoto are in different technical fields and have different technical problems to be solved. Murata's adhesive sheets are after all nothing but a peelable paper product. There is no reason to believe that Murata was even tempted to replace his peelable paper products with a tape of polypropylene or PET with a mirror-surface simply because such products happened to be known and/or available commercially (for use for a totally different purpose).

It is therefore believed that the present invention is not obvious even if Murata is considered in combination with the likes of Sakumoto and hence that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Keiichi Nishimura
Registration No. 29,093

August 24, 2006
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP
500 12th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, California 94607
Telephone: (510) 663-1100
Telefax: (510) 663-0920